

1 GORDON H. DePAOLI  
2 Nevada State Bar No. 00195  
3 DALE E. FERGUSON  
4 Nevada State Bar No. 4986  
5 WOODBURN AND WEDGE  
6 6100 Neil Road, Suite 500  
7 Reno, Nevada 89511  
8 Telephone: 775 / 688-3000

9 Attorneys for WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION  
10 DISTRICT

11 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

12 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) IN EQUITY NO. C-125  
14 ) SUBFILE NO. C-125-B

15 Plaintiff, )

16 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, )

17 Plaintiff-Intervenor, )

18 v. )

19 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, )  
20 a corporation, et al., )

21 Defendants. )

22 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
23 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, )

24 Counterclaimants, )

25 v. )

26 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, )  
27 et al., )

28 Counterdefendants. )

**WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION  
DISTRICT'S PRELIMINARY  
LEGAL THEORIES IN SUPPORT  
OF DEFENSES TO THE TRIBAL  
CLAIMS**

**I. INTRODUCTION.**

Pursuant to the Court's August 20, 2007, Order (Doc. No. 1221), the Walker River Irrigation District (the "District") submits preliminary legal theories supporting its defenses to the First Amended Counterclaim filed by the Walker River Paiute Tribe (the "Tribe") and the First, Second and Third Claims for Relief asserted in the First Amended Counterclaim of the United States, which claims are referenced in the Case Management Order (Doc. No. 108) as the "Tribal Claims." These "defensive legal theories" are preliminary, and will evolve as this matter moves forward.

The District's preliminary defensive legal theories are intended to assist the parties and the Court in developing the threshold issues which the Case Management Order requires be addressed at the outset of this litigation. They are based upon a review of the Tribe's First Amended Counterclaim, the United States' First Amended Counterclaim, the Submission of Preliminary Legal Theories by the Walker River Paiute Tribe and the United States of America dated October 18, 2007 (the "Tribe and United States Preliminary Legal Theories"), and background information presently available to the District. Although the defensive legal theories are preliminary, some detail is included, in part to also assist the parties and the Court in developing discovery which the Case Management Order provides is to be allowed with respect to the threshold issues.

**II. THE WALKER RIVER DECREE.**

Based upon the Tribe and United States Preliminary Legal Theories, it is clear that the Tribal Claims are based entirely upon the federal implied reservation of water doctrine. The 1908 decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Winters v. United States*, 207 U.S. 564 (1908), is regarded as the case which gave birth to that doctrine. *Winters* has come to stand for the proposition that the United States, in establishing Indian Reservations, impliedly reserved enough water to fulfill the purposes of the Reservation.

1 Not long after *Winters* was decided, the United States commenced an action (the "Walker  
 2 River Action") in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada asserting an implied  
 3 reserved water right for the Walker River Indian Reservation which had been set aside on November  
 4 29, 1859, and formally established by executive order on March 23, 1874. The Complaint in the  
 5 Walker River Action was filed on July 3, 1924, and an Amended Complaint was filed on March 19,  
 6 1926. See, *United States v. Walker River Irrigation District*, 11 F.Supp. 158 (D. Nev. 1935).  
 7 However, before the Walker River Action was filed, pursuant to Acts of Congress in 1902 and 1906  
 8 and an Agreement between the United States and Tribe of July 20, 1906, about 268,000 acres of the  
 9 original Reservation were ceded to the United States. These lands were opened to entry by a  
 10 Proclamation of President Theodore Roosevelt on October 29, 1906. See, *Northern Paiute Nation v.*  
 11 *United States*, 8 Cl. Ct. 470, 473-475 (1985).

12 The claim asserted by the United States in the Walker River Action was based upon the  
 13 implied reservation of water doctrine. The court summarized the Amended Complaint filed by the  
 14 United States as follows:

15 [T]he United States on November 29, 1859, being the owner of the lands now  
 16 constituting Walker River Indian Reservation, reserved and set aside lands for the use  
 17 of the Pahute and other Indians for the purpose of affording them the opportunity to  
 18 acquire the arts of husbandry and civilization; that said lands are arid and incapable  
 19 of producing crops without artificial irrigation; that approximately 11,000 acres of  
 20 said lands are susceptible to irrigation from Walker River and have no other source of  
 21 water supply . . . 150 cubic feet of water per second of time from said river are  
 22 necessary for the irrigation of the irrigable lands of said reservation, and without said  
 23 water said lands will become of little or no value; that the government by the  
 24 reservation of said lands reserved 150 cubic feet of water per second for the irrigation  
 thereof . . .

25 *United States v. Walker River Irrigation District*, 11 F.Supp at 159-60.

26 The *Winters* court had placed strong reliance on the treaty between the United States and the  
 27 Indians. It was argued in the Walker River Action that *Winters* was distinguishable because the  
 28

1 Walker River Indian Reservation had been established by executive order. The trial court agreed,  
2 and held that:

3  
4 The rights of the government, in its use of waters of the Walker River and its  
5 tributaries for purposes of irrigation, like the rights of all other diverters in the  
6 Walker River Basin, are to be adjudged, measured, and administered in accordance  
7 with the laws of appropriation as established by the state of Nevada.

8 Id., 11 F.Supp at 167.

9 Therefore, the water rights awarded to the United States by the trial court were limited both  
10 as to priority date and quantity based upon actual beneficial use on the Reservation. Based upon that  
11 conclusion, a decree (the "Walker River Decree") was entered on April 14, 1936.

12 On appeal, the Ninth Circuit found no difference between reservations established by treaty  
13 and those established by executive order. It noted that it would be irrational to assume that in  
14 establishing an Indian reservation by executive order, the United States set aside the arid soil without  
15 reserving the means of rendering it productive. The court held that there was an implied reservation  
16 of water to the extent reasonably necessary to supply the needs of the Indians. *United States v.*  
17 *Walker River Irrigation District*, 104 F.2d 334, 339-40 (9th Cir. 1939). This holding anticipated the  
18 Supreme Court's similar ruling on the same issue in *Arizona v. California*, 373 U.S. 546, 598 (1963).

19 The court next turned to the question as to the quantity of water necessary to supply the needs  
20 of the Tribe. The court noted that the "tillable land reserved" is an area of approximately 10,000  
21 acres. However, speaking to the issue of quantification, the court said:

22  
23 The problem is one of great practical importance, and a priori theories ought not to  
24 stand in the way of a practical solution of it. The area of irrigable land included in  
25 the reservation is not necessarily the criterion for measuring the amount of water  
26 reserved, whether the standard be applied as of 1859 or as of the present. The extent  
27 to which the use of the stream might be necessary and could only be demonstrated by  
28 experience.

104 F.2d at 340.

1           The United States sought a decree limiting the quantity of water for the Reservation to 150  
2 cubic feet per second. Noting that a decree of this sort would "tend greatly to depreciate the value of  
3 the water rights of the upstream owners," the court turned to the Report of the Special Master. That  
4 Report indicated that about 1,900 acres were in cultivation in 1886, and that at the time the  
5 complaint was filed, about 2,000 acres were in irrigation. The Report also indicated that the  
6 population on the Reservation had been fairly stable since 1866. The Special Master had  
7 recommended a cultivated area of 2,100 acres with a water right of 26.25 cubic feet per second for  
8 180 days during the irrigation season. Accepting those recommendations, the court said that this was  
9 "a fair measure of the needs of the government as demonstrated by 70 years experience." *Id.*, at 340.

12           On April 24, 1940, the Nevada District Court amended the Walker River Decree consistent  
13 with the mandate of the court of Appeals. Thus, the Walker River Action confirmed the existence of  
14 an implied reserved water right for the Walker River Indian Reservation, and determined the quantity  
15 of water needed to fulfill the purpose of that reservation.

17           It is against this background that the District submits its preliminary defensive legal theories  
18 to claims now moving forward nearly 72 years after entry of the Walker River Decree. Although  
19 these defensive legal theories are, to a certain extent, common to all of the Tribal Claims, the District  
20 addresses each of the Tribal Claims separately.

### 21       **III. THE WEBER RESERVOIR CLAIMS.**

#### 22           **A. Background.**

23           In their Amended Counterclaims, the Tribe and the United States each claim a right to store  
24 13,000 acre feet of water in Weber Reservoir, plus evaporation and seepage, with a priority date of  
25 April 15, 1936. The United States asserts that Weber Reservoir was practically completed in 1935,  
26 and the Tribe alleges that portions of the Reservoir were completed in 1935. Both allege that  
27  
28

1 through the use of Weber Reservoir for the storage of water, the Tribe may irrigate more land than  
2 the 2,100 acres for which a water right was recognized in the Walker River Action.

3  
4 Neither, the Tribe, nor the United States, differentiates in the First Amended Counterclaims  
5 between the use of Weber Reservoir to "regulate" the 26.25 cubic feet per second water right  
6 recognized by the Walker River Decree, and the use of Weber Reservoir for "conservation storage"  
7 independent of that recognized water right.<sup>1</sup> Neither, the United States, nor the Tribe, differentiates  
8 in the First Amended Counterclaims between the use of water from Weber Reservoir to irrigate lands  
9 which were included in the Reservation when the Walker River Decree was entered, and lands which  
10 were added to the Reservation in 1936 after the Decree was entered.  
11

12 However, in the Tribe and United States Preliminary Legal Theories, the United States and  
13 the Tribe do appear to differentiate between use of Weber Reservoir to regulate the water right  
14 recognized in the Walker River Decree, and the use of Weber Reservoir for conservation storage for  
15 purposes of irrigating lands in addition to the land for which a water right is allowed under the terms  
16 of the Walker River Decree. In addition, in those Preliminary Legal Theories, the United States and  
17 the Tribe also appear to differentiate between use of Weber Reservoir to irrigate lands within the  
18 Reservation when the Decree was entered, and lands added to the Reservation subsequent to the date  
19 of entry of the Decree. See, Tribe and United States Preliminary Legal Theories, at pg. 4. Because it  
20 is not clear at this point in time that the United States and the Tribe are conceding that Weber  
21 Reservoir may only be used for regulatory purposes in connection with the irrigation of land which  
22 formed a part of the Reservation at the time the Decree was entered, the District submits its  
23 Preliminary Defensive Legal Theories based upon the assumption that such a concession has not  
24  
25  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> "Regulation" would involve no additional water beyond that recognized by the Walker  
28 River Decree. "Conservation storage" would involve water over and above the water right  
recognized by the Walker River Decree.



1 been made.

2  
3 **B. Storage on the Reservation.**

4 Although it will be necessary to conduct extensive discovery related to Weber Reservoir, it  
5 does not seem credible that Weber Reservoir, which was constructed and substantially completed by  
6 1935, a year **before** the trial court's decision in the Walker River Action, was intended to provide  
7 conservation storage to irrigate lands which are not arable and would not be added to the Reservation  
8 until **after** that decision. Indeed, the facts appear to be otherwise.

9  
10 Construction of a storage reservoir for purposes of irrigating land on the Walker River Indian  
11 Reservation was suggested and considered by the United States at least as early as 1900. The Weber  
12 Reservoir site itself was investigated some years prior to 1926. Congress expressly authorized  
13 further study by an Act approved June 30, 1926, Public Law No. 422, 69th Congress, S 2826. A  
14 detailed report on storage for the Reservation was submitted by the Department of the Interior to  
15 Congress in December 1926 (the "Blomgren Report"). Some of this happened before the Walker  
16 River Action was filed, and much of it happened while that action was in its initial stages, and before  
17 a judgment was entered.

18  
19 Moreover, the Blomgren Report suggests that throughout the pendency of the Walker River  
20 Action, the United States contemplated construction of a reservoir for several purposes. First, the  
21 United States had determined that, even if it was awarded the earliest priority on the river for 150  
22 cubic feet per second for the irrigation of 10,000 acres, the Walker River in its natural condition (no  
23 upstream use of water), would be adequate for the full season irrigation of the total irrigable area of  
24 10,000 plus acres of the Reservation, only one season of every two. The United States had  
25 determined that a first priority right for 150 cubic feet per second would only allow for the every  
26 season irrigation of 4,000 acres on the Reservation. Thus, it contemplated conservation storage of  
27  
28

1 water over and above the claim it was asserting. Second, during that same time frame, the United  
2 States contemplated the construction of a storage reservoir for purposes of "regulating" any water  
3 right which was granted to the Tribe. Finally, it contemplated the use of a reservoir to store water  
4 during the peak runoff period, so that during the low flow period later in the year, upstream diverters  
5 would not be required to cease diversions to meet the Tribe's first priority water right. During the  
6 low flow period, the United States had determined that losses in conveying water to the Reservation  
7 could be 35%.

8  
9  
10 **C. Preliminary Defensive Legal Theories - Weber Reservoir Claims.**

11 Based upon the foregoing, and the factual information presently available to the District, the  
12 District's Preliminary Defensive Legal Theories with respect to the Weber Reservoir Claims are as  
13 follows:

14 1. The implied reservation of water rights doctrine does not encompass a claim for  
15 conservation storage of water.

16 2. Any claim for a conservation storage water right for Weber Reservoir for purposes of  
17 irrigating lands within the Reservation when the Walker River Decree was entered is barred by the  
18 doctrines of claim preclusion and issue preclusion.

19 3. Any claim for a conservation storage water right for Weber Reservoir for purposes of  
20 irrigating lands added to the Reservation after the date the Walker River Decree was entered is  
21 barred by the doctrines of claim preclusion and issue preclusion.

22 4. Lands added to the Reservation after the entry of the Walker River Decree were not  
23 added for purposes of irrigation, and are not practically irrigable.

24 5. Through its commencement and resolution of claims against the United States, the  
25 Tribe's claims for a conservation storage water right for Weber Reservoir has been waived and is  
26  
27  
28



extinguished.

6. Any claim for a conservation storage water right for Weber Reservoir is barred by the doctrine of laches. See, e.g., Cayuga Indian Nation of New York v. Pataki, 413 F.3d 266 (2d. Cir. 2005) cert. den. 126 S.Ct. 2022 (2006).

7. Any claim for a conservation storage water right for Weber Reservoir is barred by the doctrine of estoppel.

#### **IV. THE CLAIMS FOR LANDS ADDED TO THE RESERVATION AFTER ENTRY OF THE WALKER RIVER DECREE.**

##### **A. Background.**

In their First Amended Counterclaims, the United States and the Tribe contend that they are entitled to a water right for lands added to the Reservation by an order dated September 25, 1936, and made pursuant to an act of Congress of June 22, 1936, 49 Stat. 1806-07 (the "Added Lands"). In their Joint Submission of Preliminary Legal Theories, the United States and the Tribe base this claim on the implied reservation doctrine, and state that quantification of the implied reserved water right "will depend, in part, on the standard to be applied by the court." Tribe and the United States Preliminary Legal Theories, at pg. 7.

##### **B. Preliminary Defensive Legal Theories - Added Lands Claims.**

Based upon the foregoing and the factual information presently available to the District, the District's Preliminary Defensive Legal Theories with respect to the Added Lands Claims are as follows:

1. Any claim for a water right for the Added Lands is barred by the doctrines of claim preclusion and issue preclusion.

2. The primary purpose for adding the Added Lands to the Walker River Indian Reservation does not require water.

1           3.       The implied reservation of water doctrine requires, at the time of reservation, that the  
2 water source be within the lands being reserved; when added to the Reservation, neither the Walker  
3 River nor any of its tributaries flowed through the Added Lands, and therefore the Walker River was  
4 not a source from which the United States could impliedly reserve water.  
5

6           4.       The Tribe's historic connection with the Added Lands does not require water use;  
7 irrigation of the Added Lands is not practically or economically feasible; and the Added Lands are  
8 not susceptible to future economic development. Therefore, no water should be quantified for the  
9 Added Lands.  
10

11           5.       By any quantification standard, the Added Lands are not susceptible of sustained  
12 irrigation, are not arable, and cannot be feasibly irrigated at a reasonable cost. Quantification of a  
13 water right for the Added Lands under the implied reservation doctrine is inconsistent with existing  
14 and relied upon water rights of the States of Nevada and California, political subdivisions of those  
15 States, including the District, and other private appropriators.  
16

17           6.       Through its commencement of and resolution of claims against the United States, the  
18 Tribe's claims for a water right for the Added Lands has been waived and is extinguished.

19           7.       Any claim for a water right for the Added Lands is barred by the doctrine of laches.

20           8.       Any claim for a water right for the Added Lands is barred by the doctrine of estoppel.

21 **V.       THE CLAIMS FOR UNDERGROUND WATER.**

22 **A.       Background.**

23           In their claims for a water right for underground water, the United States and the Tribe  
24 contend that the original Walker River Action did not adjudicate the groundwater rights of any of the  
25 parties in the litigation. They each contend that the Tribe is entitled to use underground water on all  
26 lands, including those within the Reservation on the date of entry of the Walker River Decree, and  
27  
28

1 those added to the Reservation after the Decree was entered, all with a priority date of November 29,  
2 1859. In their Joint Submission of Preliminary Legal Theories, the Tribe and the United States base  
3 this claim on the implied reservation of water doctrine, and also state that the quantification of the  
4 underground water right will depend in part on the standard to be applied by the Court. Tribe and  
5 United States Preliminary Legal Theories, at pgs. 8-9.

7 **B. Preliminary Defensive Legal Theories - Underground Water Claims.**

8 Based upon the foregoing and the factual information presently available to it, the District's  
9 preliminary defensive legal theories with respect to the claims for underground water are as follows:  
10

11 1. The implied reservation of water rights doctrine does not support a claim to  
12 underground water.

13 2. The implied reservation of water rights doctrine involves the reservation of sufficient  
14 unappropriated water to meet a reservation's needs from sources available on the reservation, and a  
15 reserved right to groundwater may only be found where other waters are inadequate to accomplish  
16 the purpose of a reservation. The quantity of water required to accomplish the purpose of the Walker  
17 River Indian Reservation was litigated and determined in the Walker River Action. Therefore, any  
18 claim to additional water from an underground source is barred by the doctrines of claim and issue  
19 preclusion, both with respect to lands included in the Reservation at the time the Decree was entered,  
20 and with respect to lands added to the Reservation after the Decree was entered.

21 3. Water for lands added to the Reservation after the Decree was entered is not required  
22 to fulfill the primary purpose for their addition to the Reservation.

23 4. The Tribe's historic connection to the Added Lands does not require use of  
24 underground water; irrigation of the Added Lands with underground water is not practically or  
25 economically feasible; and the Added Lands are not susceptible to future economic development  
26  
27  
28

1 based upon use of underground water. Therefore, no underground water should be quantified for  
2 Added Lands.

3  
4 5. By any quantification standard, the Added Lands are not susceptible of sustained  
5 irrigation, are not arable, and cannot be feasibly irrigated at a reasonable cost. Quantification of a  
6 water right from underground water for the Added Lands under the implied reservation doctrine is  
7 inconsistent with existing and relied upon water rights of the States of Nevada and California,  
8 political subdivisions of those States, including the District, and other private appropriators.


9  
10 6. Through its commencement of and resolution of claims against the United States, the  
11 claims for a water right from underground sources has been waived and is extinguished.

12 7. Any claim for a water right from underground sources is barred by the doctrine of  
13 laches.

14 8. Any claim for a water right from underground sources is barred by the doctrine of  
15 estoppel.

16  
17 DATED this 28th day of December, 2007.

18 WOODBURN AND WEDGE

19  
20 By: 

GORDON H. DePAOLI

DALE E. FERGUSON

6100 Neil Road, Suite 500

Reno, Nevada 89511

Attorneys for WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION  
DISTRICT

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I am an employee of Woodburn and Wedge and that on the 28th day of December, 2007, I electronically served the foregoing *Walker River Irrigation District's Preliminary Legal Theories in Support of Defenses to the Tribal Claims* to the following via their email addresses:

Linda Ackley  
lackley@water.ca.gov

Marta Adams  
maadams@ag.state.nv.us

Greg Addington  
greg.addington@usdoj.gov

George Benesch  
gbenesch@sbcglobal.net

Karen Peterson  
kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com

Simeon Herskovits  
simeon@communityandenvironment.net

John W. Howard  
johnh@jwhowardattorneys.com

Michael D. Hoy  
Michael D Hoy mhoy@nevadalaw.com

Erin K.L. Mahaney  
emahaney@waterboards.ca.gov

David L. Negri  
david.negri@usdoj.gov

Michael W. Neville  
michael.neville@doj.ca.gov

Susan Schneider  
susan.schneider@usdoj.gov

1  
2 Laura Schroeder  
3 counsel@water-law.com

4 Stacey Simon  
5 ssimon@mono.ca.gov

6 Wes Williams  
7 wwilliams@stanfordalumni.org

8 and I further certify that I served a copy of the foregoing to the following by U.S. Mail, postage  
9 prepaid, this 28th day of December, 2007:

10 Kenneth Spooner  
11 General Manager  
12 Walker River Irrigation District  
13 P.O. Box 820  
14 Yerington, NV 89447

William W. Quinn  
Office of the Field Solicitor  
Department of the Interior  
401 W. Washington St., SPC 44  
Phoenix, AZ 85003

13 Mary Hackenbracht  
14 Deputy Attorney General  
15 State of California  
16 1515 Clay St., 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
17 Oakland, CA 94612-1413

Tracy Taylor  
Division of Water Resources  
State of Nevada  
901 S. Stewart St.  
Carson City, NV 89701

17 Garry Stone  
18 United States District Court Water Master  
19 290 S. Arlington Ave., 3rd Floor  
20 Reno, NV 89501

Allen Biaggi  
Dir. of Conservation & Natural Resources  
State of Nevada  
901 S. Stewart St.  
Carson City, NV 89701

20 John Kramer  
21 Dept. of Water Resources  
22 1416 Ninth St.  
23 Sacramento, CA 95814

Wesley G. Beverlin  
Malissa Hathaway McKeith  
Lewis, Brisbois, Bisgaard & Smith LCP  
221 N. Figueroa St., Suite 1200  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

24 James Shaw  
25 Water Master  
26 U.S. Board of Water Commissioners  
27 P.O. Box 853  
28 Yerington, NV 89447

Robert L. Auer  
Lyon County District Attorney  
31 S. Main St.  
Yerington, NV 89447

Tim Glidden  
U. S. Dept. of the Interior, Office of the

Cheri Emm-Smith  
Mineral County District Attorney



Secretary, Div. Of Indian Affairs  
1849 C St. N.W.  
Mail Stop 6456  
Washington, D.C. 20240

P. O. Box 1210  
Hawthorne, NV 89415

Marshall S. Rudolph, Mono County  
Counsel  
Stacy Simon, Deputy County Counsel  
Mono County  
P. O. Box 2415  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546-2415


William E. Schaeffer  
P. O. Box 936  
Battle Mountain, NV 89820

Todd Plimpton  
Belanger & Plimpton  
1135 Central Ave.  
P.O. Box 59  
Lovelock, NV 89419

Nathan Goedde, Staff Counsel  
California Dept. of Fish and Game  
1416 Ninth St., #1335  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Jeff Parker  
Deputy Atty. General  
Office of the Attorney General  
100 N. Carson St.  
Carson City, NV 89701-4717

Timothy A. Lukas  
P.O. Box 3237  
Reno, NV 89505

  
\_\_\_\_\_